

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-24 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 25-27 have been amended to address the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 112 rejections. No new matter has been added. These amendments are not intended to narrow the scope of the claims.

**Drawing Objections**

The Examiner objected to the drawings as allegedly not showing all of the claim features. This objection is moot given the amendment of claim 26. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to withdraw these objections.

**35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Par. Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly not being supported by the specification or being enabled. This objection is moot given the amendment of claim 26. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to withdraw these rejections.

**35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Par. Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants have amended claims 25 and 27 to address the antecedent basis issues. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to withdraw these rejections.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yee in view of Minamio. Applicants traverse these rejections because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Regarding claim 25, Yee fails to disclose at least the following limitations:

- b) disposing an adhesive layer on said first face of said leadframe, whereby said adhesive layer covers said die pad portion, and part of said inner lead portion of each of said plurality of protuberances, wherein part of each of said inner lead portions remains free of adhesive;
- c) severing said outer lead portion from said inner lead portion by cutting said post portion;
- d) mounting said integrated circuit chip on said leadframe, whereby said second face of said integrated circuit chip is connected to said a first face of said die pad portion through said adhesive layer, and whereby said second face of said integrated circuit is further connected to said inner lead portions through said adhesive layer;

We first note that the Examiner concedes that Yee fails to disclose or suggest step c. Regarding steps b) and d), there are no embodiments in Yee that disclose an adhesive layer that covers both the die pad portion and a part of the inner lead portion. For example, Figure 3D which the Examiner uses to show the protuberances, does not show the die or adhesive attached to a part of the inner lead portion. We also note that figures 7A, B and D shows a dies attached to a lead. However, those embodiments do not have the claimed protuberance that has an inner lead portion, an outer lead portion, and a post portion.

Regarding Minamio, it also fails to disclose steps b) and d). In addition, the Examiner asserts that it would be obvious to combine the severing teaching of Minamio with Yee because

it would be “advantageous.” However, the Examiner has not explained why one of skill in the art would find it to be “advantageous” to do so.

Regarding claim 26, it should be allowable at least based on its dependence from claim 25.

Regarding claim 27, it should be allowable for reasons similar to claim 25. For example, none of the cited references disclose steps b) or c) shown below:

b) disposing an adhesive layer on said first face of said leadframe, whereby said adhesive layer covers said die pad portion, and part of said inner lead portions, wherein part of each of said inner lead portions remains free of adhesive;

c) mounting said integrated circuit chip on said leadframe, whereby said second face of said integrated circuit chip is connected to a first face of said die pad portion through said adhesive layer, and whereby said second face of said integrated circuit is further connected to said inner lead portions through said adhesive layer;

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
U.S. APPLN. NO.: 10/721,382

ATTY DOCKET NO.: Q78432

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl J. Pellegrini  
Registration No. 40,766

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 28, 2007